

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
San Francisco Division

San Francisco Division

ALLISON BARTON RICE

Plaintiff,

V.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-04250-LB

**ORDER DENYING THE CCSF
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, GRANTING
SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO THE
INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS, AND
GRANTING THE PLAINTIFF
JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS
FOR FOUR DEFENSES**

Re: ECF Nos. 132, 135

INTRODUCTION

The narrow issue at summary judgment is whether there are triable issues of fact about whether the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) violated the Fair Housing Act when it denied the plaintiff's request to have a rent-paying roommate in his below-market-rate condominium. The purchase agreement allowed leasing only with the CCSF's written permission. The CCSF denied him permission. Trible issues of fact exist about whether the CCSF understood the request to be for a paying roommate and whether the accommodation was necessary or reasonable. The court denies the CCSF summary judgment (but grants the unopposed motion for summary judgment in favor of the individual defendants).

The court also grants the plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings on the CCSF's equitable defenses of good faith, unclean hands, proper conduct, and acting in good faith.

1

STATEMENT

2

1. The Denial of a Rent-Paying Roommate

3

The plaintiff bought a below-market-rate condominium in San Francisco in 2004 through a program administered by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. The purchase agreement contained the terms of purchase and restrictions, including a requirement that he could not lease any part of the condominium without the agency's written consent.¹ From 2004 until 2009, the plaintiff — a former Naval Service member who has been diagnosed with a one-hundred-percent disability rating for his service-connected depression and paranoid schizophrenia — lived there alone.² He was “overwhelmingly lonely” and “felt that having a roommate would be good for his psychological well-being.” “[H]e came to this conclusion because, in the past, it had a significant positive impact on his mental health and interpersonal skills.”³

4

Because he wanted a roommate to help him maintain his mental health, in late 2008 or early 2009, the plaintiff called Edith Horner, an employee of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, who told him over the phone — but not in writing — that he could have a roommate. He did not ask her whether he could charge the roommate rent “because he believed that [rent] was inherent in the definition of the word [roommate]” and below-market-rate homeowners need to obtain permission for a roommate only when that roommate will be paying rent.⁴ As part of that process, he told Ms. Horner and her supervisor David Sobel that he wanted to divide the one bedroom into two, and after they told him that it was “copacetic,” he secured the necessary approval from the building department and finished the partition in August 2009.⁵

6

7

¹ Letter from C. Yin to A. Rice, Ex. 12 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-13 at 2; Condominium Agreement, Ex. 4 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-5 at 6 (§ 6.1). Citations refer to material in the Electronic Case File (ECF); pinpoint citations are to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of documents and, for depositions, to the page and line numbers.

8

² Pl.’s Resp. to Defs.’ 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. 2 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-3 at 7–8; Lines Report, Ex. 3 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-4 at 9–10 (¶ 33).

9

³ Lines Report, Ex. 3 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-4 at 9–10 (¶ 33).

10

⁴ Pl.’s Resp. to Defs.’ 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. 2 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-3 at 8; Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-4 at 3–4 (pp. 155:22–158:10).

11

⁵ Rice Dep., Ex. A to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-3 at 5 (pp. 69:1–71:10), 6 (p. 73:2–21), 8 (p. 94:9–14); Lines Report, Ex. 3 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-4 at 9–10 (¶ 33).

1 In September 2009, the plaintiff's first rent-paying roommate moved in.⁶ From then until
2 October 31, 2017, the plaintiff had rent-paying roommates most of the time.⁷

3 In March 2016, he reviewed his condominium agreement and realized that it required written
4 consent to lease any portion of the condominium. He tried to obtain written consent that month: he
5 emailed Ms. Horner explaining the issue and asking for written confirmation, but she did not
6 respond. In September 2017, his primary-care physician at the VA (Dr. Alison Ludwig) sent a
7 letter to the agency recommending approval of his request for a roommate.⁸ (In her deposition, Dr.
8 Ludwig testified that by "roommate," she meant a rent-paying roommate.⁹) On October 19 and 22,
9 2017, the plaintiff emailed Sandra Gates-Anderson and Cissy Yin at the agency, included his
10 earlier emails and Dr. Ludwig's letter, and described Ms. Horner's earlier verbal approval (in 2008
11 or 2009) of his request for a roommate.¹⁰ In the October 22 email, he said that the written-consent
12 requirement in the Agreement "absolutely escaped [his] attention and memory," the agency did
13 not respond to his prior emails, he reasonably relied on Ms. Horner (given his many contacts with
14 her, his principal contact at the agency), and his failure to obtain written consent for the roommate
15 was an honest mistake by an honest person. He asked the agency to honor Ms. Horner's previous
16 verbal permission.¹¹ Ms. Gates-Anderson responded that the information had been forwarded to
17 the agency's compliance department because "they now have the file."¹²

18 On October 26, 2017, Ms. Yin responded in a letter as follows:

19 As a part of the Program, the Agency and you entered into a Declaration of Resale
20 Restrictions and Option to Purchase Agreement ("Declaration of Restrictions")

21

⁶ Rice Dep., Ex. A to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-3 at 8 (pp. 94:15–95:4).

22 ⁷ Pl.'s Resps. to Defs.' 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. 2 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-3 at 34–35.

23 ⁸ *Id.* at 8; Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-4 at 4–6 (pp. 158:11–167:1); Email String,
24 Ex. O to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-16 at 3; Letter from A. Ludwig, Ex. P to Murphy Decl. – ECF
No. 132-17.

25 ⁹ Ludwig Dep., Ex. F to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-5 at 5 (p. 60:7–13); Ludwig Dep., Ex. 11 to
Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-6 at 4 (pp. 54:19–55:11).

26 ¹⁰ Email String, Ex. 7 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-8; Email String, Ex. 8 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No.
145-9 at 12–17.

27 ¹¹ Email String, Ex. 8 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-9 at 12–17.

28 ¹² Email String, Ex. 7 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-8 at 2.

1 dated September 23, 2004, and recorded on October 25, 2004, as document number
2 2004-H838555-00. Pursuant to Section 6.1 of the Declaration of [Restrictions], you
3 are required to occupy the Property as your principal residence and prohibited from
4 "leasing the Property, or any portion thereof, without the Agency's prior written
5 consent". It has been brought to MOHCD's attention that you have been leasing out
6 the Property and collecting rents without MOHCD's prior written consent.

7 Although you may have received verbal approval by the Agency to have a
8 roommate, there is no record that the Agency approved you leasing out your
9 Property. This unapproved lease of the Property is a direct violation of the
10 covenants and restrictions in the [Declaration] of Restrictions ("Default") and
11 constitutes an Event of Default as described in Section 11.1(b) of the Declaration of
12 Restrictions.

13 We have received the September 19, 2017 letter provided by your primary care
14 physician. You may have roommates, without charging rents. You may travel as
15 long as you continue to live in the Property as your primary residence. Primary
16 residence is defined in Section 4 (aa) of the Declaration of Restrictions, which
17 requires you to reside at the Property for at least ten (10) months out of each
18 calendar year. If you plan to travel more than two (2) months out of a calendar year,
19 you are required to first notify MOHCD and submit the supporting travel
20 documents for MOHCD's written approval.

21 In addition, a temporary lease of the Property will only be granted in circumstances
22 where the household is forced to temporarily relocate due to employment
23 requirements, or where the household is temporarily experiencing financial
24 hardship, both of which must be reviewed and approved by MOHCD in its sole
25 discretion. Furthermore, the total period for which the Property may be leased shall
26 not exceed 12 months pursuant to the MOHCD's current temporary rental policy.
27 In review of your financial documentation on your recent refinance request, you do
28 not appear to qualify for a financial hardship exemption based on your current debt-
to-income ratio.

29 **TO CURE THIS DEFAULT**, you must terminate any lease of the Property, and
30 declare that you will not lease any part of the Property in the future without the
31 prior written consent of MOHCD. Please submit evidence that you have terminated
32 any lease and the notarized declaration to our office by no later than **5:00PM,**
33 **Thursday, November 2, 2017**. If you have any questions, you may contact me [by
34 phone or by email]. . . . If you fail to contact our office by this date, MOHCD may
35 take enforcement action based on rights and remedies available to it under the
36 Declaration of Restrictions.¹³

37
38 The plaintiff responded by email that day to Ms. Yin (and cc'ing her colleagues Keith
39 Nagayama and Maria Benjamin and Sean Fitzgerald at First Republic Bank) asking for an
40

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
5550
5551
5552
5553
5554
5555
5556
5557
5558
5559
5560
5561
5562
5563
5564
5565
5566
5567
5568
5569
55610
55611
55612
55613
55614
55615
55616
55617
55618
55619
55620
55621
55622
55623
55624
55625
55626
55627
55628
55629
55630
55631
55632
55633
55634
55635
55636
55637
55638
55639
55640
55641
55642
55643
55644
55645
55646
55647
55648
55649
55650
55651
55652
55653
55654
55655
55656
55657
55658
55659
55660
55661
55662
55663
55664
55665
55666
55667
55668
55669
55670
55671
55672
55673
55674
55675
55676
55677
55678
55679
55680
55681
55682
55683
55684
55685
55686
55687
55688
55689
55690
55691
55692
55693
55694
55695
55696
55697
55698
55699
556100
556101
556102
556103
556104
556105
556106
556107
556108
556109
556110
556111
556112
556113
556114
556115
556116
556117
556118
556119
556120
556121
556122
556123
556124
556125
556126
556127
556128
556129
556130
556131
556132
556133
556134
556135
556136
556137
556138
556139
556140
556141
556142
556143
556144
556145
556146
556147
556148
556149
556150
556151
556152
556153
556154
556155
556156
556157
556158
556159
556160
556161
556162
556163
556164
556165
556166
556167
556168
556169
556170
556171
556172
556173
556174
556175
556176
556177
556178
556179
556180
556181
556182
556183
556184
556185
556186
556187
556188
556189
556190
556191
556192
556193
556194
556195
556196
556197
556198
556199
556200
556201
556202
556203
556204
556205
556206
556207
556208
556209
556210
556211
556212
556213
556214
556215
556216
556217
556218
556219
556220
556221
556222
556223
556224
556225
556226
556227
556228
556229
556230
556231
556232
556233
556234
556235
556236
556237
556238
556239
556240
556241
556242
556243
556244
556245
556246
556247
556248
556249
556250
556251
556252
556253
556254
556255
556256
556257
556258
556259
556260
556261
556262
556263
556264
556265
556266
556267
556268
556269
556270
556271
556272
556273
556274
556275
556276
556277
556278
556279
556280
556281
556282
556283
556284
556285
556286
556287
556288
556289
556290
556291
556292
556293
556294
556295
556296
556297
556298
556299
556300
556301
556302
556303
556304
556305
556306
556307
556308
556309
556310
556311
556312
556313
556314
556315
556316
556317
556318
556319
556320
556321
556322
556323
556324
556325
556326
556327
556328
556329
556330
556331
556332
556333
556334
556335
556336
556337
556338
556339
556340
556341
556342
556343
556344
556345
556346
556347
556348
556349
556350
556351
556352
556353
556354
556355
556356
556357
556358
556359
556360
556361
556362
556363
556364
556365
556366
556367
556368
556369
556370
556371
556372
556373
556374
556375
556376
556377
556378
556379
556380
556381
556382
556383
556384
556385
556386
556387
556388
556389
556390
556391
556392
556393
556394
556395
556396
556397
556398
556399
556400
556401
556402
556403
556404
556405
556406
556407
556408
556409
556410
556411
556412
556413
556414
556415
556416
556417
556418
556419
556420
556421
556422
556423
556424
556425
556426
556427
556428
556429
556430
556431
556432
556433
556434
556435
556436
556437
556438
556439
556440
556441
556442
556443
556444
556445
556446
556447
556448
556449
556450
556451
556452
556453
556454
556455
556456
556457
556458
556459
556460
556461
556462
556463
556464
556465
556466
556467
556468
556469
556470
556471
556472
556473
556474
556475
556476
556477
556478
556479
556480
556481
556482
556483
556484
556485
556486
556487
556488
556489
556490
556491
556492
556493
556494
556495
556496
556497
556498
556499
556500
556501
556502
556503
556504
556505
556506
556507
556508
556509
556510
556511
556512
556513
556514
556515
556516
556517
556518
556519
556520
556521
556522
556523
556524
556525
556526
556527
556528
556529
556530
556531
556532
556533
556534
556535
556536
556537
556538
556539
556540
556541
556542
556543
556544
556545
556546
556547
556548
556549
556550
556551
556552
556553
556554
556555
556556
556557
556558
556559
556560
556561
556562
556563
556564
556565
556566
556567
556568
556569
556570
556571
556572
556573
556574
556575
556576
556577
556578
556579
556580
556581
556582
556583
556584
556585
556586
556587
556588
556589
556590
556591
556592
556593
556594
556595
556596
556597
556598
556599
556600
556601
556602
556603
556604
556605
556606
556607
556608
556609
556610
556611
556612
556613
556614
556615
556616
556617
556618
556619
556620
556621
556622
556623
556624
556625
556626
556627
556628
556629
556630
556631
556632
556633
556634
556635
556636
556637
556638
556639
556640
556641
556642
556643
556644
556645
556646
556647
556648
556649
556650
556651
556652
556653
556654
556655
556656
556657
556658
556659
556660
556661
556662
556663
556664
556665
556666
556667
556668
556669
556670
556671
556672
556673
556674
556675
556676
556677
556678
556679
556680
556681
556682
556683
556684
556685
556686
556687
556688
556689
556690
556691
556692
556693
556694
556695
556696
556697
556698
556699
556700
556701
556702
556703
556704
556705
556706
556707
556708
556709
556710
556711
556712
556713
556714
556715
556716
556717
556718
556719
556720
556721
556722
556723
556724
556725
556726
556727
556728
556729
556730
556731
556732
556733
556734
556735
556736
556737
556738
556739
556740
556741
556742
556743
556744
556745
556746
556747
556748
556749
556750
556751
556752
556753
556754
556755
556756
556757
556758
556759
556760
556761
556762
556763
556764
556765
556766
556767
556768
556769
556770
556771
556772
556773
556774
556775
556776
556777
556778
556779
556780
556781
556782
556783
556784
556785
556786
556787
556788
556789
556790
556791
556792
556793
556794
556795
556796
556797
556798
556799
556800
556801
556802
556803
556804
556805
556806
556807
556808
556809
556810
556811
556812
556813
556814
556815
556816
556817
556818
556819
556820
556821
556822
556823
556824
556825
556826
556827
556828
556829
556830
556831
556832
556833
556834
556835
556836
556837
556838
556839
556840
556841
556842
556843
556844
556845
556846
556847
556848
556849
556850
556851
556852
556853
556854
556855
556856
556857
556858
556859
556860
556861
556862
556863
556864
556865
556866
556867
556868
556869
556870
556871
556872
556873
556874
556875
556876
556877
556878
556879
556880
556881
556882
556883
556884
556885
556886
556887
556888
556889
556890
556891
556892
556893
556894
556895
556896
556897
556898
556899
556900
556901
556902
556903
556904
556905
556906
556907
556908
556909
556910
556911
556912
556913
556914
556915
556916
556917
556918
556919
556920
556921
556922
556923
556924
556925
556926
556927
556928
556929
556930
556931
556932
556933
556934
556935
556936
556937
556938
556939
556940
556941

1 accommodation for his disability in the form of a rent-paying roommate.¹⁴ On November 1, 2017,
2 Ms. Yin replied, reiterating the rules of the below-market-rate program and saying, “The
3 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is not applicable to this situation.”¹⁵ Also on November 1,
4 2017, the plaintiff terminated the lease with his then-current roommate and sent a copy of the
5 termination agreement to the agency.¹⁶ The agency deemed that response sufficient to cure the
6 default.¹⁷

7 In response to the agency’s October 26, 2017 letter, the plaintiff asked his then-current
8 roommate if she would continue living with him without paying rent, but did not otherwise seek a
9 roommate who would not pay rent.¹⁸ Over the five months following the letter, he continued to
10 email and call Ms. Yin and Ms. Benjamin, asking for an accommodation in the form of a rent-
11 paying roommate. He again was told that he could have a roommate who did not pay rent or, if he
12 qualified for a temporary financial hardship, a rent-paying roommate.¹⁹

13 The agency’s employees never asked the plaintiff why he needed a rent-paying roommate to
14 help with his disabilities, and they did not respond to his requests for an in-person meeting.²⁰ Ms.
15 Yin testified that when a program beneficiary requests a disability accommodation, the agency
16 relies on the beneficiary to describe the disability.²¹ Also, Ms. Benjamin testified that during this
17 time, she had a conversation with the plaintiff in which she told him he could have a roommate
18

19
20 ¹⁴ Email String, Ex. 8 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-9 at 7–9.

21 ¹⁵ *Id.* at 5–7.

22 ¹⁶ *Id.* at 5.

23 ¹⁷ *Id.* at 3.

24 ¹⁸ Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-4 at 11 (pp. 233:1–235:16).

25 ¹⁹ *Id.* at 12–13 (pp. 239:2–10, 240:1–41:6); Yin Dep., Ex. 13 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-14 at 5–6
26 (pp. 56:25–57:9, 59:13–17); Benjamin Dep., Ex. 15 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-16 at 6 (p. 75:11–
20); Pl.’s Resps. to Defs.’ 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. 2 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-3 at 9; Email
27 String, Ex. 8 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-9 at 2–3; Emails, Ex. 18 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-
19.

28 ²⁰ Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-4 at 7 (pp. 180:4–182:1), 13 (pp. 240:1–241:6);
Yin Dep., Ex. 13 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-14 at 5–6 (pp. 55:22–57:9, 59:13–25); Benjamin
Dep., Ex. 15 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-16 at 6 (pp. 73:23–74:3, 75:11–20).

²¹ Yin Dep., Ex. E to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-6 at 4 (p. 31:20–24).

1 who contributed financially other than by paying rent, such as by paying for groceries and
2 utilities.²² The plaintiff testified that this phone call was “extraordinarily unproductive.”²³

3 On December 13, 2017, the plaintiff informed Ms. Yin that he intended to sell his
4 condominium “‘under protest,’ primarily because the [agency] . . . ignored [his] disability and
5 denie[d] that the ADA is applicable.”²⁴ Another reason he intended to move was to find a place he
6 could afford. Ultimately, in May 2018, he sold the condominium and moved to Austin, Texas.²⁵

7 Also in May 2018, the plaintiff submitted a complaint about the agency’s alleged disability
8 discrimination to the San Francisco office of the federal Department of Housing and Urban
9 Development (HUD). HUD closed the file after concluding that the “federal fair housing laws do
10 not cover the . . . bases of the alleged discrimination” because the plaintiff’s medical
11 documentation did not establish “a disability related need to rent [his] home to roommates.” The
12 San Francisco HUD office’s closure letter stated that the office’s decision “does not represent a
13 judgment upon the merits of the allegations” and that the plaintiff could still “file a civil action in
14 an appropriate United States District Court.”²⁶ The plaintiff then asked HUD’s central office in
15 Washington, D.C., to overturn that decision, but it declined.²⁷

17 2. The Plaintiff’s Need for a Rent-Paying Roommate

18 The plaintiff provided information about his disability and his need for a rent-paying
19 roommate.

20 As described above, the plaintiff has a one-hundred-percent disability rating for his service-
21 connected depression and paranoid schizophrenia. The summary-judgment record establishes
22

23 ²² Benjamin Dep., Ex. C to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-4 at 10–11 (pp. 76:22–77:16).

24 ²³ Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-4 at 7 (pp. 180:24–181:14).

25 ²⁴ Email String, Ex. V to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-23.

26 ²⁵ Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-3 at 7 (pp. 89:19–90:6); Pl.’s Resps. to Defs.’ 1st
27 Set of Interrogs., Ex. 2 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-3 at 6, 9.

²⁶ HUD Compl., Ex. T to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-21; S.F. HUD Decision Letter, Ex. S to
Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-20; S.F. HUD Closure Letter, Ex. U to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-
22.

²⁷ D.C. HUD Decision Letter, Ex. R to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-19.

1 childhood trauma and his struggles since, including his foundational feelings of loneliness and
2 isolation.²⁸ “When he is alone, his mental health deteriorates,” and “[i]t becomes near impossible
3 for [him] to perform the normal functions of daily life.” But being with others alleviates the
4 symptoms. And having a roommate “help[s] . . . treat the symptoms of his disabilities.” He wants
5 a roommate who is an “equal partner:” “it [is] important that a roommate contribute to the
6 maintenance of the home, both administratively and financially.” He has tried living with a
7 roommate who did not pay rent, but “in each case, the living arrangement was not helpful.” “The
8 relationship would deteriorate, and [the] [p]laintiff’s symptoms . . . were exacerbated, including
9 his irritability and paranoid thoughts regarding others’ intentions.”²⁹

10 Dr. Ludwig testified that a roommate who did not pay rent “would actually take away some of
11 the mental health benefits” to the plaintiff of having a roommate.³⁰ The plaintiff’s expert, Dr. Scott
12 Lines, opined that a roommate who did not pay rent “would not have had the same beneficial
13 therapeutic effect” on the plaintiff and “would have exacerbated the symptoms of [his] depressive
14 disorder by diminishing his self-esteem and feelings of self-worth.”³¹

15 Dr. Ludwig testified that it “seems like” a roommate who paid for all utilities would have “the
16 same mental health benefit” for the plaintiff as one who contributed to the rent. As for a roommate
17 who paid for all groceries, Dr. Ludwig testified that the mental-health benefit to the plaintiff
18 would depend on the plaintiff’s “interpretation” of that scenario.³² In his report, Dr. Lines used the
19 word “roommate” in the sense of “an individual who cohabitates a living space with another

20
21
22
23
24 ²⁸ For HIPPA and privacy reasons, the order does not recite the evidence, but the opposition
summarizes and cites the evidence in a sealed section. Opp’n – ECF No. 144-2 at 5–6.

25 ²⁹ Pl.’s Resps. to Defs.’ 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. 2 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-3 at 7–8, 14; Rice
26 Dep., Ex. 5 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-5 at 7–8 (pp. 229:19–233:24).

27 ³⁰ Ludwig Dep., Ex. 11 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-6 at 7 (pp. 90:22–91:10).

28 ³¹ Lines Report, Ex. 3 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-4 at 18–19 (¶ 62).

³² Ludwig Dep., Ex. 11 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-6 at 4 (p. 56:7–25).

1 person, and who contributes to the financial cost of maintaining the home.”³³ He testified that a
2 financial contribution means an equitable contribution.³⁴

3. The Below-Market-Rate Program

5 The CCSF offered evidence about the below-market-rate program.

6 “The purpose of the [below-market-rate program] is to provide [below-market-rate]
7 homeownership opportunities to low- and moderate-income households.” “The [p]rogram’s long-
8 term sustainability requires restrictions on resale prices” so that “homes can be sold at affordable
9 prices again and again.”³⁵ Mr. Sobel testified that “[t]he resale price is set according to a formula”
10 that does not take into account any rental income received by the selling beneficiary.³⁶

11 The rental restriction in the below-market-rate program exists because “[below-market-rate]
12 homes are a valuable and scarce community resource.” “One of [the] fundamental principles in
13 providing affordable housing is that the beneficiary not profit off of the public benefit.”³⁷ Ms.
14 Benjamin testified that “throughout all affordable housing programs, not only in San Francisco but
15 [also] across the country[,] . . . there are prohibitions on gaining income from an affordable
16 housing public interest.”³⁸ Thus, beneficiaries are told multiple times that they cannot rent out any
17 portion of their property.³⁹ The only exception is when written consent to the lease is provided in
18 the case of a beneficiary’s temporary financial hardship.⁴⁰

19
20³³ Lines Report, Ex. 3 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-4 at 5 (¶ 9 n.1).

21³⁴ Lines Dep., Ex. G to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-6 at 4–5 (pp. 80:5–83:23).

22³⁵ Defs.’ Am. Resps. to Pl.’s 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. J to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-11 at 4–5.

23³⁶ Sobel Dep., Ex. 6 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-7 at 4 (pp. 91:10–92:13).

24³⁷ Defs.’ Am. Resps. to Pl.’s 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. J to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-11 at 5;
Condominium Agreement, Ex. Q to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-18 at 2 (§ 2); Benjamin Dep., Ex. C
to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-4 at 9 (pp. 71:23–72:22); Yin Dep., Ex. E to Murphy Decl. – ECF
No. 132-6 at 5 (pp. 45:24–46:11).

25³⁸ Benjamin Dep., Ex. C to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-4 at 3 (p. 36:10–22).

26³⁹ Sobel Dep., Ex. D to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-5 at 5 (pp. 30:4–32:3); Yin Dep., Ex. E to
Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-6 at 8 (p. 73:9–16).

27⁴⁰ Benjamin Dep., Ex. C to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-4 at 5–6 (pp. 44:19–45:3); Yin Dep., Ex. E
to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-6 at 9 (p. 81:5–8); Defs.’ Am. Resps. to Pl.’s 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex.
J to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-11 at 5.

1 There are administrative and financial burdens associated with permitting rentals. Mr. Sobel
2 testified that there could be issues with a resale if a program beneficiary had a tenant at the time of
3 resale: for example, the tenant might damage the property or have rights that might encumber the
4 property.⁴¹ Ms. Benjamin testified that there are administrative burdens with monitoring the
5 selection of the tenant and the duration of the lease and a financial burden from the resulting need
6 for increased staffing.⁴² She said that the financial burden would be different in scale if one
7 beneficiary was allowed a rental versus “ten of them.”⁴³ Ms. Yin testified that burden was not a
8 factor in the decision to deny the plaintiff’s request for a rent-paying roommate: the only factor
9 was that the request was inconsistent with the nature of the below-market-rate program.⁴⁴ She also
10 testified that the agency has a process in place for managing temporary rentals by program
11 beneficiaries.⁴⁵

12

13 **4. Relevant Procedural History**

14

15 The court previously dismissed all claims in the FAC.⁴⁶ The plaintiff — who was representing
16 himself at the time — appealed.⁴⁷ The Ninth Circuit generally affirmed the dismissal except for
17 the dismissal of the Fair Housing Act claim: it held that, liberally construed, the plaintiff alleged
18 that his requested accommodation of a rent-paying roommate was reasonable and necessary to
accommodate his mental-health disability and that the CCSF failed to provide a reasonable

19

20

21

22 ⁴¹ Sobel Dep., Ex. D to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-5 at 10 (pp. 94:3–95:23); Defs.’ Am. Resps. to
23 Pl.’s 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. J to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-11 at 5.

24 ⁴² Benjamin Dep., Ex. C to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-4 at 6 (pp. 47:14–48:11); Defs.’ Am. Resps.
to Pl.’s 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. J to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-11 at 5.

25 ⁴³ Benjamin Dep., Ex. 15 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-16 at 4–5 (pp. 48:19–49:3).

26 ⁴⁴ Yin Dep., Ex. E to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-6 at 5 (pp. 45:24–46:11), 6 (p. 65:1–8); Yin Dep.,
Ex. 13 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-14 at 3–4 (pp. 48:23–49:7).

27 ⁴⁵ Yin Dep., Ex. 13 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-14 at 8 (pp. 81:9–82:4).

28 ⁴⁶ Order – ECF No. 58.

⁴⁷ Notice of Appeal – ECF No. 61.

1 accommodation for his disability when it refused to grant an exception to the agreement to permit
2 him a rent-paying roommate. It remanded on this ground.⁴⁸

3 All parties consented to magistrate-judge jurisdiction.⁴⁹ The court held a hearing on
4 December 22, 2022.

5 STANDARDS OF REVIEW

6 1. Summary Judgment — Rule 56

7 The court must grant summary judgment where there is no genuine dispute as to any material
8 fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a);
9 *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247–48 (1986). Material facts are those that may
10 affect the outcome of the case. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248. A dispute about a material fact is
11 genuine if there is sufficient evidence for a reasonable jury to return a verdict for the nonmoving
12 party. *Id.* at 248–49.

13 The party moving for summary judgment has the initial burden of informing the court of the
14 basis for the motion and identifying portions of the pleadings, depositions, answers to
15 interrogatories, admissions, or affidavits that demonstrate the absence of a triable issue of material
16 fact. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322–23 (1986). To meet its burden, “the moving
17 party must either produce evidence negating an essential element of the nonmoving party’s claim
18 or defense or show that the nonmoving party does not have enough evidence of an essential
19 element to carry its ultimate burden of persuasion at trial.” *Nissan Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Fritz*
20 *Cos.*, 210 F.3d 1099, 1102 (9th Cir. 2000); *see Devereaux v. Abbey*, 263 F.3d 1070, 1076 (9th Cir.
21 2001) (“When the nonmoving party has the burden of proof at trial, the moving party need only
22 point out ‘that there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party’s case.’”) (quoting
23 *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 325). “Where the moving party will have the burden of proof on an issue at
24 trial, the movant must affirmatively demonstrate that no reasonable trier of fact could find other
25 than for the moving party.” *Soremekun v. Thrifty Payless, Inc.*, 509 F.3d 978, 984 (9th Cir. 2007).

26
27 ⁴⁸ *Rice v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, No. 20-15017, Mem. Op. – ECF No. 63.

28 ⁴⁹ Consents – ECF Nos. 4, 14, and 18.

1 If the moving party meets its initial burden, then the burden shifts to the nonmoving party to
2 produce evidence supporting its claims or defenses. *Nissan*, 210 F.3d at 1103. “Once the moving
3 party carries its initial burden, the adverse party may not rest upon the mere allegations or denials
4 of the adverse party’s pleading, but must provide affidavits or other sources of evidence that set
5 forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.”) *Devereaux*, 263 F.3d at 1076
6 (cleaned up).

7 “Once the moving party carries its initial burden, the adverse party may not rest upon the mere
8 allegations or denials of the adverse party’s pleading, but must provide affidavits or other sources
9 of evidence that set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.” *Devereaux*,
10 263 F.3d at 1076 (cleaned up) (quoting *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 322–23). If the non-moving party
11 does not produce evidence to show a genuine issue of material fact, the moving party is entitled to
12 summary judgment. *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 322–23.

13 In ruling on a motion for summary judgment, the court does not make credibility
14 determinations or weigh conflicting evidence. Instead, it views the evidence in the light most
15 favorable to the non-moving party and draws all factual inferences in the non-moving party’s
16 favor. *E.g.*, *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587–88 (1986);
17 *Ting v. United States*, 927 F.2d 1504, 1509 (9th Cir. 1991).

18
19 **2. Judgment on the Pleadings — Rule 12(c)**

20 “After the pleadings are closed — but early enough not to delay trial — a party may move for
21 judgment on the pleadings.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c). “[T]he same standard of review applicable to a
22 Rule 12(b) motion applies to its Rule 12(c) analog,” because the motions are “functionally
23 identical.” *Dworkin v. Hustler Mag., Inc.*, 867 F.2d 1188, 1192 (9th Cir. 1989). A Rule 12(c)
24 motion may thus be predicated on either (1) the lack of a cognizable legal theory or (2) insufficient
25 facts to support a cognizable legal claim. *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699
26 (9th Cir. 1988). When considering a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(c), the court “must accept all
27 factual allegations in the complaint as true and construe them in the light most favorable to the
28 non-moving party.” *Fleming v. Pickard*, 581 F.3d 922, 925 (9th Cir. 2009). “A judgment on the

1 pleadings is proper if, taking all of [the plaintiff]’s allegations in its pleadings as true, [the
2 defendant] is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” *Compton Unified Sch. Dist. v. Addison*, 598
3 F.3d 1181, 1185 (9th Cir. 2010) (Smith, J., dissenting) (citing *Westlands Water Dist. v. Firebaugh*
4 *Canal*, 10 F.3d 667, 670 (9th Cir. 1993)).

5

6 ANALYSIS

7 An issue is whether summary judgment should be granted in favor of the individual
8 defendants. In his opposition, the plaintiff did not oppose summary judgment.⁵⁰ The individual
9 defendants are in any event redundant, and the court grants summary judgment to them. *See, e.g.*,
10 *Ctr. for Bio-Ethical Reform, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cnty. Sheriff Dep’t*, 533 F.3d 780, 799 (9th Cir.
11 2008) (“When both a municipal officer and a local government entity are named, and the officer is
12 named only in an official capacity, the court may dismiss the officer as a redundant defendant.”).

13 There are three remaining issues: (1) whether the CCSF failed to accommodate the plaintiff, in
14 violation of the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3604; (2) whether the CCSF unlawfully interfered
15 with the plaintiff’s rights under the Fair Housing Act, *id.* § 3617; and (3) whether the court should
16 grant judgment in favor of the CCSF on the equitable defenses.

17

18 1. Failure to Accommodate — Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2604

19 A municipality discriminates under the Fair Housing Act if it refuses to make reasonable
20 accommodations in “rules, policies, practices, or services, when such accommodations may be
21 necessary to afford [a disabled] person equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.” 42 U.S.C.
22 § 3604(f)(3)(B); *Budnick v. Town of Carefree*, 518 F.3d 1109, 1119 (9th Cir. 2008). To establish a
23 claim of discrimination on a theory of failure to reasonably accommodate under § 3604(f)(3), a
24 plaintiff must demonstrate that (1) he is handicapped as defined by § 3602(h), (2) the defendant
25 knew or reasonably should have known about the handicap, (3) accommodation of the handicap
26 may be necessary to afford the handicapped person an equal opportunity to use and enjoy the
27

28 ⁵⁰ *See generally* Opp’n to Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 145.

1 dwelling, (4) the accommodation is reasonable, and (5) the defendant refused to make the
 2 requested accommodation. *Budnick*, 518 F.3d at 1119; *Dubois v. Ass'n of Apartment Owners of*
 3 *2987 Kalakaua*, 453 F.3d 1175, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006). “To prove that an accommodation is
 4 necessary, plaintiffs must show that, but for the accommodation, they likely will be denied an
 5 equal opportunity to enjoy the housing of their choice.” *Giebeler v. M & B Assocs.*, 343 F.3d
 6 1143, 1155 (9th Cir. 2003) (cleaned up). “Put another way, without a causal link between [the]
 7 defendants’ policy and the plaintiff’s injury, there can be no obligation on the part of defendants to
 8 make a reasonable accommodation.” *Id.* (cleaned up).

9 The CCSF moved for summary judgment on the grounds that it granted the plaintiff’s request
 10 for accommodation in the form of a roommate (albeit not a rent-paying roommate), a rent-paying
 11 roommate was not necessary as a matter of law, and a rent-paying roommate was not reasonable
 12 as a matter of law.⁵¹ Genuine disputes of material fact preclude summary judgment.

13 First, the CCSF contends that it granted the accommodation because the plaintiff asked for a
 14 roommate and the CCSF was not “on notice that [he] required a rent-paying roommate.”⁵² As the
 15 plaintiff counters, it is at least in dispute whether the agency knew that he was asking for a rent-
 16 paying roommate.⁵³ Moreover, he asked for confirmation in writing, explaining that he had
 17 reviewed his condominium agreement and realized that it required written consent to lease any
 18 portion of the condo.⁵⁴ And multiple CCSF employees testified that they knew the plaintiff was
 19 requesting a rent-paying roommate.⁵⁵

20 Second, the CCSF contends that as a matter of law, a rent-paying roommate was not a
 21 necessary accommodation because “[n]o treating doctor has ever told [the plaintiff] it was
 22

23 ⁵¹ Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 132 at 16–22.

24 ⁵² *Id.* at 17–18.

25 ⁵³ Opp’n to Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 145 at 10–12.

26 ⁵⁴ Condominium Agreement, Ex. 4 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-5 at 6 (§ 6.1); Email String, Ex. O
 27 to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-16 at 3; Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-4 at 4 (pp.
 158:11–159:25), 12 (p. 239:2–21).

28 ⁵⁵ Yin Dep., Ex. 13 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-14 at 5–6 (pp. 56:25–57:9, 59:13–17); Benjamin
 Dep., Ex. 15 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-16 at 6 (p. 75:11–20).

1 important for his mental health that he have a roommate who pays rent,” he lived alone in the
 2 condominium from 2004 to 2009, and he did not explore the possibility of his roommate’s paying
 3 for groceries and utilities rather than rent.⁵⁶ These points are disputed too. There is evidence in the
 4 record that the plaintiff explained to agency personnel that he needed a rent-paying roommate.⁵⁷
 5 His primary-care physician and his expert opined that a rent-paying roommate was necessary.⁵⁸
 6 *Yellowstone Womens First Step House, Inc. v. City of Costa Mesa*, No. SACV 14-01852 JVS
 7 (JCGx), 2018 WL 6164307, at *11 (C.D. Cal. July 13, 2018) (genuine dispute of material fact on
 8 the necessity issue where the plaintiff “present[ed] evidence showing that . . . residents received
 9 therapeutic benefits from” the requested accommodation). The record also has evidence about the
 10 plaintiff’s realization of his need for a roommate, which at least is a fact that counters the
 11 contention that he lived alone previously. And it is disputed whether there was an interactive
 12 process to explore an accommodation in the form of other ways a roommate could contribute
 13 financially: the plaintiff characterizes the conversations with the agency as unproductive.

14 On this last point, the CCSF’s citation in its reply brief to *Vorchheimer v. Philadelphiaian*
 15 *Owners Ass’n*, 903 F.3d 100, 112–13 (3d Cir. 2018), does not change the outcome.⁵⁹ The plaintiff
 16 there asked to leave her walker in her apartment building’s lobby to meet her medical need
 17 (established by her doctor’s letters) to use the walker to get from the lobby to her apartment. *Id.* at
 18 103–04. The defendant offered four alternatives for ready access to the walker; the plaintiff
 19 rejected them because she wanted to get the walker herself in the lobby. *Id.* The court held that the
 20 plaintiff did not plausibly plead that her requested accommodation was necessary given the

21
 22
 23 ⁵⁶ Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 132 at 18–19.

24
 25 ⁵⁷ Rice Dep., Ex. B to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-4 at 12 (p. 239:2–7). As to any argument that the
 26 statement to the expert is inadmissible hearsay, the point is covered generally by the deposition
 27 testimony. Also, the court can consider it at summary judgment if the underlying evidence “could be
 28 provided in an admissible form at trial, such as by live testimony.” *JL Beverage Co. v. Jim Beam*
Brands Co., 828 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2016) (citing *Fraser v. Goodale*, 342 F.3d 1032, 1036–37
 (9th Cir. 2003)); see *Curnow ex rel. Curnow v. Ridgecrest Police*, 952 F.2d 321, 324 (9th Cir. 1991).

⁵⁸ Ludwig Dep., Ex. 11 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-6 at 7 (pp. 90:22–91:10); Lines Report, Ex. 3 to
 Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-4 at 9 (¶ 33), 18–19 (¶ 62).

⁵⁹ Reply in Supp. of Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 149 at 7–10.

1 accommodations that were offered: the Fair Housing Act’s “necessity element requires that an
2 accommodation be essential, not just preferable.” *Id.* at 105–07, 112–13.

3 The accommodations here are not equivalent in the way they were in *Vorchheimer*: it is at least
4 disputed that a roommate who pays for food and utilities is equivalent to a roommate who shares
5 the financial burden, given the expert’s opinion that a roommate with an unequal contribution
6 would “exacerbate[]” the plaintiff’s symptoms.⁶⁰ Also, the Third Circuit’s recitation of the
7 “essential” standard differs from the Ninth Circuit’s characterization: “plaintiffs must show that,
8 but for the accommodation, they likely will be denied an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing of
9 their choice.” *Giebeler*, 343 F.3d at 1155 (cleaned up); *see also Roman v. Jefferson at Hollywood*
10 *LP*, 495 F. App’x 804, 805 (9th Cir. 2012) (under the Fair Housing Act, a plaintiff must show that
11 the “accommodation ‘may be necessary’”).

12 Third, the CCSF contends that a rent-paying roommate was not a reasonable accommodation
13 because permitting beneficiaries of the below-market-rate program to rent portions of their homes
14 would fundamentally alter the nature of the program and impose administrative and financial
15 burdens on the CCSF.⁶¹

16 Under the Fair Housing Act, “[t]he reasonable accommodation inquiry is highly fact-specific,
17 requiring case-by-case determination.” *United States v. Cal. Mobile Home Park Mgmt. Co.*, 29
18 F.3d 1413, 1418 (9th Cir. 1994). An accommodation is reasonable when it does not impose any
19 (1) “fundamental alteration in the nature of the program” or (2) “undue financial or administrative
20 burdens.” *Giebeler*, 343 F.3d at 1157 (cleaned up); *Wolf v. City of Millbrae*, No. 21-cv-00967-
21 PJH, 2021 WL 3727072, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2021).

22 “[W]here a rule is peripheral to the nature of [the] defendants’ activities, ‘it may be waived in
23 individual cases without working a fundamental alteration.’” *Giebeler*, 343 F.3d at 1157 (quoting
24 *PGA Tour, Inc. v. Martin*, 532 U.S. 661, 689 (2001)). As to burden, policies are not unreasonable
25 “simply because they . . . may involve a risk of some financial cost to the landlord.” *Id.* at 1153.

26
27 ⁶⁰ Lines Report, Ex. 3 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 144-4 at 5 (¶ 9 n.1), 18–19 (¶ 62); Lines Dep., Ex. G
to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 133-6 at 4–5 (pp. 80:5–83:23).

28 ⁶¹ Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 132 at 19–22.

1 And where the defendant “ha[s] on occasion waived” the policy and allowed “alternative
2 arrangements,” the burden associated with an individual exception may not be enough to make the
3 accommodation unreasonable. *Id.* at 1158 (reversing summary judgment); *see U.S. Airways, Inc.*
4 *v. Barnett*, 535 U.S. 391, 405–06 (2002) (although “in the ordinary [ADA] case” an exception to a
5 seniority system is unreasonable, “[t]he plaintiff might show that the system already contains
6 exceptions such that, in the circumstances, one further exception is unlikely to matter”).

7 Again, there are genuine disputes of material fact that preclude summary judgment. Regarding
8 burden, a CCSF employee testified that the CCSF already has a process in place for managing
9 temporary rentals by beneficiaries of the below-market-rate program.⁶² In other words, the
10 program has built-in exceptions similar to that requested by the plaintiff. The court thus cannot say
11 as a matter of law that one more exception would be unreasonable. *Giebeler*, 343 F.3d at 1158;
12 *U.S. Airways*, 535 U.S. at 405–06.

13 There also is a genuine dispute about whether the below-market-rate program’s anti-rental rule
14 is “peripheral to the nature of” the program. *Giebeler*, 343 F.3d at 1157. The CCSF admits that the
15 purpose of the program is to maintain a stable supply of affordable housing in the city by keeping
16 rates for the housing included in the program at below-market levels each time program
17 beneficiaries resell.⁶³ And a CCSF employee testified that “[t]he resale price is set according to a
18 formula” that does not take into account any rental income received by the selling beneficiary.⁶⁴
19 Thus, allowing some disabled tenants a rent-paying roommate would not affect resale prices. A
20 reasonable jury therefore could find that the program would not be fundamentally altered by
21 rentals. *See id.* (at the summary-judgment stage, an accommodation to allow a cosigner on a
22 tenancy did not “unreasonably threaten” the purpose of a minimum-income tenancy requirement
23 where there would still be prompt and consistent payment); *see also Yellowstone Womens First*
24 *Step House*, 2018 WL 6164307, at *12 (where the requested accommodation was actually in effect

25
26
27
28
62 Yin Dep., Ex. 13 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-14 at 8 (pp. 81:9–82:4).

63 Defs.’ Am. Resps. to Pl.’s 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. J to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-11 at 4–5.

64 Sobel Dep., Ex. 6 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-7 at 4 (pp. 91:10–92:13).

1 for years before the request, there was “a genuine dispute as to whether [it] would change the
2 fundamental nature of the [c]ity’s” rule to the contrary).

3 The CCSF points out that having tenants could encumber property and therefore affect
4 resales.⁶⁵ There is still a fact dispute about whether allowing rent-paying tenants would change the
5 fundamental nature of the below-market-rate program, given the CCSF’s admission that resale
6 prices would not be affected and the existence of an established process for allowing rent-paying
7 roommates.

8 In sum, the court denies summary judgment on the § 3604 claim.

10 2. Interference — Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3617

11 The next issue is whether the CCSF interfered with the plaintiff’s rights under § 3617.⁶⁶

12 The Fair Housing Act makes it “unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any
13 person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his having exercised or enjoyed, . . . any
14 right granted or protected by” the Act. 42 U.S.C. § 3617. “Interference” refers to “practices [that]
15 have the effect of interfering with the exercise of rights under the federal fair housing laws.”

16 *Walker v. City of Lakewood*, 272 F.3d 1114, 1129 (9th Cir. 2001) (cleaned up). The term
17 encompasses a housing provider’s issuing a notice to quit or to cure a default or quit in response to
18 a plaintiff’s accommodation request. *Galia v. Wasatch Advantage Grp. LLC*, No. 19-cv-08156-
19 JCS, 2021 WL 1516372, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 16, 2021) (collecting cases).

20 There is, again, at least a genuine factual dispute here. The agency’s August 26, 2017, letter to
21 the plaintiff, which was in response to the plaintiff’s accommodation request, warned that the
22 CCSF “may take enforcement action based on rights and remedies available to it” if the plaintiff
23 did not cure his default.⁶⁷ The court denies summary judgment on the § 3617 claim. *See, e.g.*,

24
25
26 ⁶⁵ Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 132 at 22; Sobel Dep., Ex. D to Murphy Decl. – ECF No. 132-5 at 10
27 (pp. 94:3–95:23); Defs.’ Am. Resps. to Pl.’s 1st Set of Interrogs., Ex. J to Murphy Decl. – ECF No.
132-11 at 5.

⁶⁶ Mot. for Summ. J. – ECF No. 132 at 22–24.

⁶⁷ Letter, Ex. 12 to Fisher Decl. – ECF No. 145-13.

1 1 *Smith v. Powdrill*, No. CV 12-06388 DDP RZX, 2013 WL 5786586, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 28,
2 2 2013) (granting summary judgment to the plaintiff where the defendants “respond[ed] to [the]
3 3 [p]laintiff’s request for an accommodation for her disability by issuing her a 3-[d]ay [n]otice, and
4 4 subsequently reiterating that they wanted [her] out of the apartment if she insisted on keeping the
5 5 companion animal”).
6

7 **3. The CCSF’s Equitable Defenses**

8 The parties dispute whether judgment is appropriate on four affirmative defenses: good faith,
9 unclean hands, proper conduct, and acting in good faith.⁶⁸ The plaintiff contends that they are not
10 relevant to his claims.⁶⁹ The CCSF counters that the defenses apply at least to remedies and also to
11 liability.⁷⁰

12 The court grants the motion. The equitable defenses are not valid defenses to liability under the
13 Fair Housing Act. *Hernandez v. Cnty. of Monterey*, 306 F.R.D. 279, 283 (N.D. Cal. 2015)
14 (affirmative defenses are about liability); *Ramirez v. Greenpoint Mortg. Funding, Inc.*, 268 F.R.D.
15 627, 636–37 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (unclean-hands defense not available under the Act because it “has
16 not been applied where Congress authorizes broad equitable relief to serve important national
17 policies”) (quoting *McKennon v. Nashville Banner Pub. Co.*, 513 U.S. 352, 360 (1995)). That said,
18 the parties’ relative conduct can be considered in evaluating any equitable remedies. *McKennon*,
19 513 U.S. at 360–61 (even where the unclean-hands defense is not available under a statute, “[t]hat
20 does not mean . . . [that] the [plaintiff]’s own misconduct is irrelevant to all the remedies otherwise
21 available under the statute”).
22
23
24
25
26

27 ⁶⁸ Opp’n to Mot. for J. on the Pleadings – ECF No. 142 at 6; Answer – ECF No. 76 at 17.
28 ⁶⁹ Mot. for J. on the Pleadings – ECF No. 135 at 8–9.
29 ⁷⁰ Opp’n to Mot. for J. on the Pleadings – ECF No. 142 at 6, 10.

CONCLUSION

The court grants summary judgment in favor of the individual defendants but denies the CCSF summary judgment. The court grants judgment on the pleadings to the plaintiff on the four equitable defenses on the ground that they are irrelevant to liability.

This disposes of ECF Nos. 132 and 135.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 13, 2023

LIBC

LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California